

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 1876.

The Week.

THE Syndicate, having succeeded in selling all the five per cent. bonds authorized by law, now want the privilege of trying a 4½ per cent. bond, to be made attractive to solid investors here and in Europe by the length of time which it runs. Accordingly, a bill has been introduced and passed by the Senate changing the time which 4½ per cent. bonds run from 15 years to 30 years, and, to make the transaction larger, increasing the amount of 4½ per cent. bonds from \$300,000,000, as now authorized, to \$500,000,000. It is a matter of record that every syndicate operation, since the refunding began, has cost the country more or less gold, and has accordingly made it more difficult for the Treasury to get the gold needed for the work of resumption. While, therefore, it is desirable that the Government should pay as low a rate of interest on its bonds as possible, it is nevertheless a question whether after all it is not a positive loss to disturb the bonded debt when by so doing payment of the demand debt is deferred, and public attention is diverted from the main question.

Besides the passage of the Funding Act and the West Point Appropriations Bill (with amendments) neither Senate nor House has accomplished anything of importance. The Senate has received a large number of petitions protesting against the repeal of the Bankrupt Act, and has discussed Mr. Anthony's resolution with regard to the accurate printing of debates, but without coming to any decision. One event of the week has been the appearance of Senator Sharon of Nevada, who was elected Senator some nine months ago, but has not thought it worth while to come to Washington before. In the House, the 3.65 District Bond Conference report has been discussed and the whole matter postponed a week, the February interest on the bonds remaining, we believe, still unpaid. The Democratic Currency Caucus Committee has had a hard week of it in endeavoring to reconcile the conflicting views of those who "roar for more soft-money" and those who are opposed to this roar. The committee is pretty evenly divided on the subject, there being some eight hard-money men on it and five anti-contractionists, as they call themselves, headed by Mr. Holman. The subject has been brought up in the House also, with the almost instantaneous result of an adjournment, hard-money Democrats uniting with Republicans in the vote; the object of the former being to prevent action on resolutions introduced by the inflationists, and the latter desiring to prevent a vote on Democratic resolutions demanding an enquiry into the whiskey frauds and Babcock's case.

The verdict of "not guilty" in General Babcock's case was probably a surprise to most people, both in and out of St. Louis, and perhaps to none more than to the General himself. Judge Dillon's charge was decidedly in the defendant's favor, rather from what he omitted to say than from any positive instructions. He referred to the high character given the accused by the President, but did not call attention to the fact that his admitted acts had not been those of a man answering to the President's description of him, and he made no reference to the color given to his telegrams and letters by the circumstance of the correspondence being clandestine. He also gave the jury a warning not to be influenced by popular clamor, but did not caution them at all against the influence of a great name and high station. All this may have been perfectly right, but it certainly helped the defendant. There can be little doubt that the political effect of the acquittal will be bad; this much may be inferred from the sudden appearance upon the scene of several notorious political scamps who had been keeping quiet lately, headed

by Boss Shepherd, and their telegraphing in very blasphemous terms their exultation over the result. Every corrupt gauger, distiller, rectifier, or revenue officer, in or out of jail, gave a sigh of relief when he heard of it.

District-Attorney Bliss has explained the proceedings of Sherman, the deputy whom he sent to the West to hunt up evidence for the Government, and who turned over what he found to General Babcock's counsel. He says that Sherman found valuable evidence which went to show General Babcock's innocence; that he—Sherman—feared that if he turned it over to Dyer it would be suppressed, and he therefore turned it over to Babcock. This conduct, Mr. Bliss says, was perfectly proper; but this is so obvious that we wonder at any question being raised about it. Mr. Bliss is a *bouffe* district-attorney, and has been acting under the orders of an Attorney-General who issued only the other day a *bouffe* order warning his subordinates that hereafter anybody who turned State's evidence against the Whiskey Rings would be severely punished by the Government. In *bouffe* prosecutions, the Government always collects the evidence, and then hands it over to the defence. Offenbach is coming to this country in a few weeks, direct from the Duchy of Gerolstein, to study our institutions, and we trust the opportunity may not be lost to bring about a meeting between him and Messrs. Bliss and Pierrepont.

Mr. James E. Lyon, who, as we have once or twice stated in these columns, knows more about the secret history of the Emma Mine than almost any other man living, has told his story to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and a shocking story it is. There are one or two features of it which deserve attention. Mr. Lyon corroborates on every important point the story of the mine as it was related in Mr. Paffard's pamphlet (which we reviewed in the *Nation* some two years ago). His position was that of actual owner of a large interest in the ore which had been taken out of the mine; and when he found that Park and Stewart were going to sell it, he clung to them in the hope of getting his money, and he was thus brought into close relations with them, and they were forced into giving him a great deal of valuable information that no one else could ever have got at. The Schenck transaction he corroborates in every important point. The story will, we fear, be cold comfort for Mr. Williams, who estimates at \$25,000 the damage done to his character by the statement that he prepared the Emma for Prof. Silliman's inspection; for Lyon says that Park told him that Williams was "the best man in the world to fix a mine for examination," and that he had "fixed up the Mariposa" for him. The story implicates a good many persons besides Park and Stewart whose cases will now have to be looked into. As to the condition of the mine at the time of the sale in England, Lyon has a letter from Stewart in which it is spoken of as "worked out."

The State Department, in response to the resolution of enquiry voted the other day by the House, has furnished the same Committee with copies of the correspondence between the Department and Gen. Schenck, showing that on his connection with the mine attracting attention from the press in England, he addressed a telegram to the Department saying that "his entire interest in the enterprise arose from the ownership of certain shares for which, after investigation, he had paid dollar for dollar" (the italics are ours), and "that he had become a director at the solicitation of respectable Americans, to protect their interests and his own," but offering to withdraw if it was deemed advisable. The Department replied, on the 28th of November, that the advertisement of his name as "a director of a Company seeking to dispose of its shares in the country to which he was accredited was ill-advised, unfortunate, and calculated to subject him to criticism," and earnestly advised him to withdraw

his name. On the 12th of January following, Schenck enclosed to Mr. Fish a copy of a letter addressed to the chairman of the Company, dated the 6th of December, resigning his directorship, and cited the well-known case of Saldanha and the Lisbon tramway in palliation or justification of his own conduct. On the 20th of December he also telegraphed, on hearing that a resolution of enquiry had passed the Senate, that he was ready for investigation. Mr. Fish then adds the following remarkable statement:

"As the resolution of the House makes a reference to the action of the Executive Department of the Government on this question, I deem it due to Gen. Schenck, as a public officer who has had various and important public trusts, and who has for many years occupied a prominent position before the country, to further state that the course adopted in the Department growing out of these facts was based on the conviction that, while the use of the name of the Minister of the United States in such an enterprise was inconsistent with his position, at the same time Gen. Schenck had been guilty of no wrong purpose or intent in connecting himself with the Company in question. I remain firmly of this opinion, and am, further, satisfied that he, in common with many others, became a sufferer thereby."

As Mr. Fish is a man of unimpeached honor, and as no recent change has to our knowledge been made in the fundamental principles of morality and in the usages which govern the conduct of gentlemen in matters of trust, we take it for granted that, when he wrote the above, he had not read Schenck's own deposition in London and the copy of his agreement with Park. If he will do so, he will see that when Schenck said that he had invested in shares and "paid dollar for dollar" for them, he was guilty of gross falsehood. He had, on the contrary, simply secretly borrowed shares from the promoter of the mine, with an agreement which absolutely protected him against loss and secured him eleven per cent. per annum profit, even supposing he paid Park seven per cent. for the use of the shares. Mr. Fish will, therefore, see at a glance that, had this arrangement leaked out, the British purchasers of the shares would have considered Schenck a dishonored man, and themselves the victims of a swindle. We must also call Mr. Fish's attention to the fact that when Schenck, by forwarding him on the 12th of January a copy of a letter of resignation of his directorship dated the 6th of December, led him to believe that the resignation had really taken place at the latter date, in consequence of his (Mr. Fish's) telegram of the 28th of November, he (Schenck) was again guilty of deceit, inasmuch as his resignation was not announced until January, thus allowing the "respectable Americans" who were promoting the mine a month longer to get rid of their shares before the British public began to suspect. We have therefore no hesitation in assuring the public that, when Mr. Fish finds time to read the documents we have mentioned, he will agree with all Protestant theologians, all modern moralists of reputation, and all gentlemen of civilized countries, in pronouncing Schenck's conduct dishonorable. Many queer things are allowed to pass in official circles just now in Washington, but Mr. Fish is not a man to lower his standard to the Shepherd level under any pressure or temptation. We notice that Mr. Fish also says he is satisfied that "General Schenck is open to no imputations whatever" arising from the Machado matter, but we feel sure that in this case also Mr. Fish has not read the correspondence. We must observe, at the same time, that when the papers were all crying out a month ago on the publication of the Wiard correspondence and the Park agreement that Schenck *must* now come home, we warned the public that he would not resign nor be asked to do so, and that he would stay in his place under the new "Fire" rule; and the reason is that, as the Government is now conducted at Washington, not only do dishonest men do dishonest things, but the honest men who are looking on have forgotten, or are forgetting, what the marks of dishonesty are.

There have been several conventions during the week, the principal ones being those of the Republicans in Indiana and of both parties in Connecticut. In Connecticut, the Republican

ticket, headed by Henry C. Harrison, of Hartford, and with Gen. F. A. Walker as candidate for Secretary of State, is a good one, and the resolutions are pronounced for hard-money, as are also those of the Democrats, notwithstanding a desperate attempt on the part of the inflationists to carry the platform. In Indiana, the Republicans have drawn up a series of resolutions as long as an article of a State constitution. They begin by "hailing" the Centennial year, then give a history of the past achievements of the party from the point of view of absolute, unbiassed, historical truth; and then proceed, "in view of this record," to promise faithfulness in the future as in the past; to deny the so-called rights of nullification and secession; to declare the independence of the national and State governments in all cases in which there is not some sort of dependence; to promise amnesty to the penitent and rebuke the impenitent rebel; to demand a reformed civil service; to protest against all encroachments of church on state or state on church; to demand a revenue system which will give "all needful encouragement" to trade, agriculture, manufactures, etc., and bring about "harmonious relations" between labor and capital, and a system of taxation which shall give "the greatest possible exemption" to articles of "primary necessity," and fall most heavily on "luxuries" and "wealth"; to demand the repeal of the Resumption Act, and that the currency be neither contracted nor expanded, but resumption be left to be brought about by the "laws of trade"; to protest against all attacks on the common-school system and other Democratic schemes; and to endorse General Grant as a patriot, and nominate Senator Morton for the Presidency. The State ticket is headed by G. S. Orth for Governor. There is not much in the Wisconsin Republican resolutions except a hard-money plank, an anti-third-term plank, and a quasi-nomination of Mr. Blaine for the Presidency. The Democrats have fixed upon St. Louis as the place and June 27 as the time for their National Convention.

The Advisory Council in Brooklyn, as was expected, decided all the points of procedure submitted to it in favor of Plymouth Church—that is, approved of what the church had done. It threw on Mrs. Moulton the responsibility of the failure of the Mutual Council, by commending the desire of Plymouth Church to exclude the local churches. Before separating, however, it fell in with the suggestion of the Andover Church so far as to appoint a Committee of Three, which should, on the request of Plymouth Church, select a Commission of Five, out of a prepared list of twenty eminent Congregationalists, to be charged with the duty of investigating any accusations that may be made against Mr. Beecher by any person declaring himself responsible for them, within a period of sixty days after the dissolution of the Council, the result of the investigation to be made public. To this Professor Egbert C. Smith, of Andover, makes serious objections in the *Congregationalist*, which we have no time to discuss this week. Mr. Bowen has, in the meantime, read his statement before the Examining Committee, but declined to remain in their company one minute after finishing, not wishing, probably, to submit himself to cross-examination. An attempt to compel or induce him to do so by locking the door was foiled by the good man's flight through the door of the back parlor, and, in his agitation, he called loudly for the "gentlemen of the press," who were on duty on the sidewalk and promptly came to his aid. Brother White, who locked the door, says it was a playful act, while Brother Bowen pronounces it the "greatest outrage of the century." The truth probably lies half-way between these two views. We would recommend, however, that Mr. Bowen be examined next time in chains. We know of no other way of securing the prolonged attendance of so astute and good a man at the meeting of a hostile body desirous of interrogating him on any subject. He likes to give his own account of things and then return promptly to his holy work.

The Treasury, in pursuance of the Sherman Act, has bought silver bullion, issuing bonds to get gold to pay for it, and has now in its vaults between \$13,000,000 and \$14,000,000 of silver

dimes, quarters, and halves. These coins are worth 95½ in greenbacks, while fractional notes are worth 100; in gold they are worth 83¾ to 84, while fractional currency is worth 87¾—the same as Treasury notes. It was the intention to begin paying out this subsidiary silver coin on the 1st of March, and to herald the movement as the beginning of specie payments and the restoration of a sound currency, on the assumption that the people would, when they saw silver coins in circulation, believe that the small change of the country had been improved. There seems, however, to be some hesitation on the part of the Treasury, and the question is, what can be done with this silver coin? If it be paid out, then the Treasury forces into circulation a currency more debased than any in use. It is true that an advance in the price of silver, now 53½d. per ounce in London, the lowest price on record, might bring it up to the gold value of the paper currency, but then the danger would be that it would be exported, and the country left with no small change. To sell it and turn it into gold would entail a heavy loss on the Government, which paid very much more for it than it is now worth. Altogether, this whole business is calculated to bring the cause of sound currency into so much contempt that we are surprised to find an inflationist like Judge Kelley attempting to restrain the Treasury from pursuing to the utmost its "silver resumption" policy. There were during the week no important changes in the Wall-Street markets, if we except a decline in speculative stocks. The bank statement showed a surplus reserve of \$13,634,950, which is \$1,293,400 less than last week, but \$4,200,000 above the corresponding week of last year. In domestic trade the season is late, and the outlook is less encouraging than at the beginning of the year. The gold price of \$100 greenbacks during the week ranged between \$87 62 and \$87 91.

The Carlist war has come to an end by the dispersal and capture of what remained of the Carlist troops and the flight of Don Carlos himself into France. The present contest has lasted four years, or two years less than the war of 1834, and, again unlike the latter, has been ended without foreign assistance. It would undoubtedly not have lasted so long but for the establishment of Castelar's Republic, and the consequent dissolution of the army and uncertainty about the future of the government. Don Carlos was, however, prevented from descending into the low country and taking any advantage of his frequent successes by the fact that the bulk of his followers were local volunteers, who were in arms for the defence of provincial *fueros* still more than for the vindication of the principle of legitimacy, and could hardly have been persuaded to advance on Madrid even if they had been sufficiently equipped for the work. The restoration of Alfonso, and the consequent increase in the vigor and unity of the operations of his army, has brought the end about somewhat more speedily than was expected, and it may be fairly predicted that the Pretender has made his last attempt. He is not likely again in his lifetime to find constitutional government in a state of so much discredit as that into which it had fallen when he raised his standard. His success will probably seat Alfonso firmly on the throne, and at the same time cause considerable discouragement in the ranks of the friends of Ultramontanism and Divine Right throughout Europe. There is not likely to be again, in our time, so strong a conservative reaction as followed on the follies and atrocities of the Commune in France and its counterpart in Spain.

M. Buffet, as was expected, resigned after his complete defeat at the elections, and there was great depression at the Bourse as long as it was uncertain how Marshal MacMahon would deal with the crisis. He met it, however, with perfect good temper, and put M. Dufaure in M. Buffet's place, and made arrangements for an entire reorganization of the Ministry, to be announced in a message at the meeting of the Chambers. All the new members of the Cabinet, except, it is said, the Duc Decazes, General Cissey, and M. Montaignac, will be taken from the Left Centre, which is probably as far to the Left as the Marshal can ever be expected to go. M. Thiers

is, in the meantime, engaged in rallying the Moderate Republicans into something like a party, and will probably have the co-operation of Gambetta, and talks, among the fresh measures to be sought, of an amnesty for all the Communists whose offences were purely political or who were plainly misled. The objections to such a step are stronger in France than they would be in any other country in the world, as something which would help to diminish, in the eyes of the city populations, the seriousness of armed attempts at revolution. It is a well-known fact that at least three generations of workmen have now grown up in Paris to whom stories of street-fighting against the troops were the great interest of their boyhood, and who in their boyhood looked forward to the defence of a barricade as one of the necessary and desirable social experiences. This tradition must be utterly broken before any French government will be completely secure.

The only news of importance from Germany is that of a powerful speech in the parliament at the close of the session, by Prince Bismarck, in which he offered the most earnest assurances of the peaceableness of the new German Empire and of the pacific temper both of the Emperor and himself. All this was apropos of the Press Bill, then under discussion, which gave him the opportunity of throwing the blame of the rumors of war last spring on the newspapers, and accusing them of complicity with the military party and of gross inefficiency in the discharge of their own duties as collectors of news and commentators on it, and of giving notice that the Government would hereafter have no relations with any of them, either official or semi-official. Whereupon, much abuse of the German press has appeared in various quarters, and much depreciation of the character and attainments of its conductors, and much invidious comparison of it with that of England and the United States. Most of this talk is, however, rather idle. The press of a country is the product of its institutions and manners, and the reflection, one may say, of its society, and it may be taken for granted that enterprise in the collection of news or power in the writing of articles will never appear in the press of any country until its complete liberty and independence are guaranteed both by the laws and by public opinion. A good newspaper cannot be made without a heavy outlay of money, and nobody will invest heavily in a business which a police magistrate may any day bring to a standstill.

A wail comes from the Chamber of Commerce in Odessa which will delight the souls of the Grangers. It has issued a report in which it says that, even so recently as 1867, 44 per cent. of the grain imported into England came from Russia. By 1873, 44 per cent. of it came from the United States, and only 21 from Russia. Between those years, it is true, the total export of Russian grain increased about ten per cent., but American total exports increased nearly fifty per cent. Now there is a positive decline in Russian exports. Moreover, the Chamber is afraid matters are going to become worse instead of better under the influence of the improvement and cheapening of transportation in this country, and they are especially alarmed by the improvements at the mouth of the Mississippi. The United States, too, is beating them out of the German market, and they fear additional competition from the Spanish states on the Pacific coast. The Russian banks are trying to place a large amount of real-estate mortgages on the London market to raise money for agricultural improvements; but the trouble with Russia is said to lie too deep for speedy cure, or cure by any investment of capital—viz., in the character of the people and in the constitution of society. It begins to be seen that the peasants, left to themselves since emancipation, and with the communal system of property, cannot compete as producers with the greater intelligence and individual ownership of Western countries, and another and greater revolution than the abolition of serfdom now begins to be called for—viz., the division of property among individuals, which would be a violent break with a social system thousands of years older than serfdom, and far more deeply rooted in the manners.

GENERAL BABCOCK AND THE ARMY.

THERE can be little doubt that a verdict of "not guilty" was the only one left to the jury in General Babcock's case by the facts as actually presented to them. The evidence introduced by the Government and admitted by the Court positively proved only as much as this—that there had been a conspiracy between the distillers and internal-revenue officers in St. Louis to defraud the Government of the whiskey tax, to which Joyce, a revenue agent, and McDonald, the supervisor, were parties; that these men were on intimate terms with General Babcock, who was in a position of trust and confidence in the President's household, and therefore was exactly the man needed by the conspirators to inform them of intended descents by revenue agents—the daily danger which they had to guard against; and that on several occasions, when the Ring had objects to further at Washington, in one case the appointment of an internal-revenue officer, in the others the prevention of descents, Babcock was discovered in active correspondence with the Ring, and rendering them material assistance. The first of these occasions was in 1873 after the death of Ford, the collector—a man greatly trusted by General Grant, but after his death suspected of being a "whiskey thief"—when Babcock interested himself in a very suspicious way in securing the appointment for the Ring's man, Constantine Maguire, since convicted.

The next evidence introduced by the Government showed that in the spring of 1874 Douglass, then Commissioner of Internal Revenue, becoming suspicious of Joyce, determined to pack him off to California, and to send a revenue agent by the name of Hogue to St. Louis to look into matters there; that notice of this intended descent was at once telegraphed by Avery, the chief clerk of the Treasury Department and one of the Ring (since convicted), to Joyce, who telegraphed back, "Telegrams received. Start for San Francisco Sunday night. All perfect here"—meaning evidently that no illicit whiskey was being made; and that at the same time he telegraphed to Babcock, "Start for San Francisco to-morrow night. Make D. call off his scandal-hounds, that only blacken the memory of poor F. (Ford) and friends. Business"; that General Babcock went to D. (Douglass) and made enquiries about the intended descent. But there is no proof that he tried to prevent the descent, and the letter which he wrote in reply to Joyce's telegram contains nothing compromising.

Joyce now went to California, but returned by leave in June, and went at once to Washington, and, on enquiry, finding there was no danger, telegraphed McDonald to "let the machine go"—or, in other words, to begin work again. Later in the summer it was determined by the Internal-Revenue Department to send Brooks, a Secret-Service detective, and Hogue, the agent, to make an investigation, and the Ring, as usual, became nervous, and began to telegraph actively. In this correspondence Babcock appears, for the first time, actively working to prevent a "raid." It was proved that on October 25 Joyce telegraphed him: "Have you talked with D.? Are things right? How?" and, on December 3, "Has Secretary or Commissioner ordered anybody here?" that a letter from Brooks to Rogers, Douglass's deputy-commissioner, relating to the intended descent, was stolen from his (Rogers's) desk, and next appeared in Babcock's possession (it was admitted that he had not stolen it); that this letter he took both to the President and to Douglass, urging on Douglass that the letter looked like blackmail—though this was obviously an absurd interpretation of it—asking him what "a sensitive man like Logan" would think if he saw such a letter, and suggesting that a superior class of persons ought to be used for work of this kind, and saying pretty much the same thing to the President; that on December 13, 1874, Douglass told Babcock that the proposed visit of Brooks and Hogue to St. Louis was "off," and that on this Babcock telegraphed McDonald at St. Louis: "I succeeded. They will not go. I will write you." This was the first despatch signed "Sylph," and usually referred to as the "Sylph" despatch.

About January 27, 1875, it was determined by the Commissioner,

after consultation with the President, to issue an order transferring the supervisors and revenue agents from one district to another. The Ring immediately began to telegraph, protesting against the order, and it was proved that Babcock again actively interfered, with Douglass and Rogers, to have the order rescinded; that while he was doing so Joyce telegraphed him (February 3): "We have official information that the enemy weakens. Push things." This despatch was also signed "Sylph," and the order was, as a matter of fact, almost immediately rescinded, on the ground, according to the President's testimony, that it would only be likely to serve as a warning to the thieves, and that an unannounced descent of some kind would be preferable. This correspondence was all in cipher, and carried on without the knowledge of the President. It was also proved that after McDonald had been indicted, and suspicion fallen on Babcock, the latter opened a clandestine correspondence with him through a third person; but this correspondence was not produced by either side on the trial.

In estimating the weight which this written evidence ought to have, there are several things necessary to be taken into consideration *pro* and *con*. There is, in the first place, the obvious consideration that on the theory of guilt it is all easily explicable. If Babcock had been one of the conspirators he would have taken just the interest he did take in furthering the objects of the St. Louis Ring, and the same means to conceal his connection with it. The appointment of Ford's successor would have aroused all his energies, and when he found that Hogue and Brooks were going to St. Louis, or that the supervisors were to be shifted about so that a new man would be placed in McDonald's place, he would (as a guilty man) have taken just the measures to have the orders rescinded that he did take, by going to Douglass or Rogers or the President and representing to them that public considerations required the use of other means. The attempt of the defence to break this down by showing that the order shifting the supervisors was really withdrawn because the President and his advisers had come to the conclusion that more effective steps might be taken, has in reality nothing in it. The question is not what the President wanted, but what the Ring wanted, and there is no question that they were greatly alarmed at the news of the order with regard to the supervisors, and began to use the most strenuous exertions to get it rescinded. When we find Babcock telegraphing under an assumed name in cipher to Joyce: "I succeeded. They will not go. I will write you," and when we find Joyce using the same signature, and telegraphing about the "weakening of the enemy" and "pushing things," and also find that things are pushed, we can only say that all this was eminently natural if Babcock were guilty, but otherwise not. And not only his despatches, but those from the other side also addressed to him, are all explicable and natural on the theory that he was, in 1874 and 1875, bound to the Ring by the closest ties. It must also be remembered that, if Babcock were innocent, he was not merely an unconcerned spectator of what was going on, but, from his position, bound to do what he could to acquaint the President and the Revenue Department with any important facts that came to his knowledge relating to the conspiracy which was all the time believed to exist. All the telegrams he received should have been shown at once; but instead of this he carries on a secret correspondence with the conspirators, and does whatever they ask him, to do at Washington.

On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the evidence is very fragmentary, and that there was no positive proof of any motive on Babcock's part. The Government undertook to prove that he received money from the Ring by mail, and a pecuniary motive would certainly be the natural one in such a case; but the only witness produced for this purpose was unable to swear positively to the fact of a letter containing money having been even addressed to General Babcock. There was no proof of its being received; so that, leaving out of view the extraordinary testimony of a letter-carrier who swore that he took the letter out of the mail and returned it to Joyce, it cannot be said that Babcock was proved even to have been offered any money.

Under these circumstances, no jury could have properly found the accused guilty. In a criminal case, a jury is not allowed to decide by a preponderance of probabilities, but must, to bring in a verdict of guilty, be satisfied beyond a "reasonable doubt" of the guilt. With the meagre evidence before them, without the benefit of hearing from General Babcock's own lips this explanation of his telegrams, or of having him tested by cross-examination, it cannot be said that his guilt was established beyond a reasonable doubt. The case illustrates very forcibly the barbarism of the common law on the subject of criminal verdicts, which, excluding by strictly artificial rules a great deal of the most important evidence, at the same time forces a jury either to acquit or to convict. The Scotch verdict "not proven" is the only one which comports with the facts in such a case as that of General Babcock.

But though the verdict of "not guilty" was, under the circumstances, the only proper one for the jury to render, the real question at issue was not whether, by resorting to every legal device in the exclusion of the evidence, a verdict of guilty could be prevented, but whether General Babcock was actually innocent. The public is in possession of a great deal of evidence on this point which did not get to the jury at all, and, when it is considered in connection with the other, his case cannot be said to be improved.

The most important of this evidence is the fact that the behavior of General Babcock since proceedings against him began has been that of a guilty man. On first learning of the accusation against him he telegraphed to St. Louis proclaiming his innocence, promising a full explanation of all his correspondence, and demanding to be heard in his defence in St. Louis. At the same time he was privately telegraphing to Luckey, the other secretary, instructions to his counsel in these words, "Tell him to employ assistance if he wants, and means, but to prevent my going there now at all hazards"; and when the trial actually took place he got the telegrams sent for this purpose ruled out on the ground that they were "confidential communications." His clandestine correspondence with McDonald he neither produced nor explained, and of his long correspondence with Joyce, extending over a period of three or four years, he omitted to produce any which related to the years 1874 and 1875, though he did produce a quantity of letters written before that time, and showing a very different relation existing between the two men from that which must have existed when they were sending "Sylph" despatches to each other. From first to last, he struggled to prevent any fragment of evidence from going to the jury which the Government did not itself produce. To cap the climax, no sort of rational explanation of the more mysterious despatches was offered even by his counsel.

In estimating the effect which the result of this trial ought to have on General Babcock's future, it will not do to forget that he held two relations to the public service. He is not merely the President's secretary, but is an officer of the army besides. The army has always been above all other professions a school of honor, and has professed to test, by a standard altogether nicer and more sensitive than that of courts of justice, the conduct of its members. What it asks is, not whether an officer has or has not committed an indictable offence, but whether he has been guilty of conduct "unbecoming an officer and a gentleman"; and in discovering this it is not bound by any technical rules of evidence or law. The military idea of the "officer and gentleman," as settled by the practice of military courts and by usage, especially excludes want of frankness or sincerity or truthfulness. The telegram, for instance, from Babcock to Luckey, telling him, at the very time that he was clamoring for an opportunity to clear himself, that his counsel in St. Louis must prevent his going there now at all hazards, was not sent by "an officer and a gentleman," and it was not the act of an officer and a gentleman, but that of a pettifogging criminal, to have it ruled out as a "privileged communication." And the whole farcical spectacle of a gentleman of high character, as the President declared him to be, accused of crime, first promising to explain all, and then sitting down as dumb as an oyster and keeping all the evidence to himself, is, in the eye of military usage, ut-

terly disgraceful. It is before a military tribunal that General Babcock ought to be summoned now. The present position of his case makes his retention in the army a public scandal, and his request, if he has really made it, to be assigned to active duty, is a piece of impudence which, if there were no such thing as "politics," would probably result in the loss of his commission on the spot. When the case first came up, General Babcock's demand for a military court of enquiry was preposterous, because all the evidence was in the hands of the District Attorney, and consequently beyond the court's reach. Now the evidence has been all produced, and the only remaining question is, What should be done with an officer whose conduct is such as to require a semi-official announcement from Washington that his resignation is in the President's hands? Ought he to be suspended or cashiered? Now that it is proposed to transfer the Indian Bureau to the care of the army, the maintenance of a rigid standard of military honor becomes of more importance than ever. The work which the army, in case of such a transfer, will undertake is nothing more nor less than watching the acts and preventing the frauds of agents and contractors who stand in the relation to the Indian Bureau that Joyce and McDonald did to the Internal Revenue. Sharpness, vigilance, and open honesty, a single eye to the interest of the Government, are the qualifications for such a duty, and we have no doubt the army is the place to look for these qualities. But these are just the qualities General Babcock has not displayed. There is, we suppose, no question in anybody's mind that his retention in the White House after such revelations as we have had of his character is a public outrage, and to send him back to the army after dismissal from any position—even that of a White House scullion—for acts such as those he has been guilty of would be a gross insult to the army, and the corrupting effect it would have on the tone of that branch of the service can hardly be estimated.

THE FRENCH REPUBLIC.

THE constitution of 1791 in France was upset in the following year by the insurrection in Paris of the terrible Tenth of August. The constitution of 1793 was then adopted, but the Convention which framed it suspended it before it went into operation, and established a revolutionary provisional government, composed of the Committee of Public Safety. This government was put an end to by the killing of the more important members of the Committee, and a commission was then appointed to draw up another constitution—that of 1795—in which the government was lodged in the hands of a Council of Elders and a Council of Five Hundred, with an executive Directory of five members. This lasted until 1799, when Bonaparte came home from Egypt and overturned it with a battalion of grenadiers, and made a new constitution, with an executive of three Consuls, of whom he himself was naturally the chief. This lasted three years, for in 1802 Bonaparte, feeling that it was ridiculous for as good a soldier as he was to have colleagues, ordered his own election by popular vote as Consul for life. This lasted two years, and then the Empire was established in 1804. This lasted until the overthrow of the Emperor in 1814, when another constitution was framed restoring the monarchy, which lasted until the Revolution of 1830, when another constitution set up what was called "the Monarchy of July," which was overthrown by the Revolution of 1848. Another constitution—this time republican—was then adopted which lasted until 1851, when it too was set aside by the *coup d'état*, and the Empire restored, which lasted until 1870, when another revolution lodged the power once more in the hands of a Provisional Government, and finally in that of an Assembly composed in the main of Royalists. We have gone over the governmental changes in French history since 1789 simply for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that every government set up, from that year until 1870, was the direct result either of the use of violence by the populace or of the threats of violence on the part of the person commanding the army. The new constitution, too, was in

every sense the work of the victors in an armed conflict, and was intended to express, and did express, the political views of the party which for the time being happened to be dominant in Paris, the capital.

One has to bear all these facts in mind in order to appreciate the importance for France, and doubtless for Europe also, of the establishment which we have just witnessed of a new government. The number of happy accidents which have contributed to or accompanied the work, has been so great as to tempt anybody who chose to be superstitious into the belief that a run of luck had begun for a country which has become notorious for the extent and duration of its political misfortunes. The rising which overthrew the Second Empire was undoubtedly due to the tremendous military disaster of Sedan, but had it not been for the continuance of the war, with its still more appalling subsequent reverses, we should undoubtedly have witnessed the proclamation by the mob of another republic of the old type, destined, in all probability, to excite general alarm, like the others, and after a brief period of trial to share the fate of the others; for the men who figured most prominently in bringing about the "déchéance" were Reds and adventurers of the same kind as those who obtained control of the Government in 1848. The prolongation of the war and the siege of Paris speedily reduced these men to insignificance, and compelled the transfer of the seat of government to the country districts, leaving the politicians of the capital, to use Bismarck's coarse but happy phrase, "to cook in their own grease." We all laughed a good deal when Gambetta went to Tours in a balloon and began issuing proclamations against the enemy on the line of the Loire, and there was a good deal that was laughable about it; but he was doing something which he had no intention of doing, and which may prove more important to France than the defeat of the Germans would have proved—that is, breaking the spell by which Paris had held the popular imagination for so many centuries, and proving to the peasantry that there might be a government outside Paris, and that all was not lost when the capital was lost, and all was not ended when the capital had spoken. The meeting of the Assembly at Bordeaux afterwards and the negotiation of the peace from that point, was another valuable confirmation of this view, and had doubtless a powerful influence on public opinion. For the first time since 1789 the occurrence of great events in Paris had not settled anything for the nation at large. The mob had "descended into the streets" and overturned the Empire, but the power to decide what should succeed it had passed out of their hands.

The new Assembly was largely monarchical in its composition, and it was fresh from panic-stricken country districts in which the destruction of the army had discredited the Empire, and Gambetta's frantic efforts at resistance had discredited the Republic. On the old plan, the proper course for the Assembly under such circumstances would have been to recall the king and proclaim a monarchy. But here again Providence seems to have interposed through M. Thiers and procured time for deliberation, under that agreement to postpone the determination of the form of the government known as the "Pact of Bordeaux." But then this, doubtless, could not have been brought about if the Germans had not held France by the throat, and were not standing ready to carry fire and sword down to the shores of the Mediterranean. The willingness of the Royalists to wait is entitled to all the more praise because at that time the follies of Gambetta, whom M. Thiers did not hesitate to call a "raging madman," had made the Republic seem another name for anarchy and dismemberment. The rising of the Commune which followed was simply the attempt of the Paris mob to reassume their old supremacy, and was inspired by rage at the sight of independent action by the country outside; and the contest which followed made the lesson of the war complete and, we trust, enduring, for it showed that Paris might rise, expel the Government, and resist desperately, without in any way changing the political situation—that, in short, for political purposes Paris was no longer France.

The five years of struggle in the Assembly which have since followed have been also a most valuable piece of political experience. The Monarchists have had, in the first place, the fullest opportunity for a peaceful trial of their own strength and of the temper of the country. They were left to discover, without let or hindrance, the depth of the chasm which separates the last descendant of the old line of kings from the nation. They found out for themselves that Henry V. had become an impossibility, and they acknowledged it. They gave him up when he wrote his letter. They discovered, too, by incessant discussion and by the trial of all sorts of combinations, how much divided they were on fundamental questions, and how little fitted they were as a party to take charge of the Government. They were brought to the adoption of the new constitution, not by the guillotine or the bayonet, or by fear for their fortunes, or by any of the old forms of coercion, but simply by five years of steady debate. The effect of this delay on Gambetta and his following was no less marked and no less happy. The Gambetta whose moderation and tactical skill we are now all admiring is by no means the Gambetta of 1871, nor yet even of 1873. He is neither any longer a Red Dictator nor Radical Reformer. He has abandoned the notion that the Republic is of divine origin, and has ceased to believe in the necessity of a new "couche sociale." Four or five years of experience in a really free parliamentary body, with, on the whole, opportunities for testing public opinion such as public men in France have never before enjoyed, have cooled his ardor, taught him the conditions of healthy political life, and revealed to him why it is that Frenchmen have feared republican government. He has got over the belief that any class of his countrymen are enemies to be hunted down or denounced, and has learned that opinions, however outrageous or dangerous, are best met by moderation and persuasion; that the gravest political problems are best solved by not trying to solve them completely; and that really good laws are, as Sir Matthew Hale said, "the production of the wisest thing in the world—Time." In short, he has become competent to give lessons to some zealots and demagogues among ourselves, and might profitably harangue Mr. G. P. Morton on "outrages" and the best method of dealing with them.

The new constitution, therefore, comes into existence under the happiest auspices. It is the product of peaceful discussion, after all the worst traditions of French politics have been discredited or destroyed by the utter failure of their supporters to devise anything else. It has been adopted by the country, in vote so free that—an event unprecedented we believe in French political history—the head of the Ministry has been unable to find a constituency in all France to return him to either branch of the legislature. It is placed, too, as far as material conditions are concerned, under the protection of an executive officer who, though not a great political head, is a gallant soldier and, what is far better, an honest gentleman, who keeps the company not of "Bosses" or speculators or gamblers, but of whatever is best in French society both morally and intellectually, and who undoubtedly does desire to give his country rest and to assure her future. And though last, not least, it goes into operation just as the people have received the most admirable illustration possible of the integrity and skill and wisdom of the national financiers, and the prudence and intelligence with which their contributions to the national treasury are managed. We may fairly hope, therefore, that the wanderings of France in the political wilderness are over, and that she has at last reached the promised land, though it must be admitted that as long as the army is as large as it is, and the temper of the people as volcanic, no political experiment can be watched with complete confidence in the result until it has lasted much longer than any of those already tried have done. What she needs above all things is to pass into the hands of a generation which has known nothing of the violent transfer of power or of its lawless exercise, and on which the established order of things has secured the strong and enduring hold of habit; and that she will effect this transition through the Septennate seems now if not certain, extremely probable.

A SENATORIAL ELECTION IN FRANCE.

PARIS, February 11, 1876.

THE elections for the new French Senate have taken place, and I have had the curiosity to see how they would take place in one of the Departments. The origin of this new creation may be cited among the few well-ascertained cases of spontaneous generation. Living, as I do, among politicians of all shades, I could not say with exactitude who invented the curious mode of suffrage which has given existence to the new Senate. The American Senate is a representation of the States, and this representation has an historical cause; our constitution-mongers felt that they were obliged not to give to the Upper House the same origin as to the Lower House—that one chamber was enough for the representation of mere numbers, of the passing and fleeting passions of the day. They dared not give a distinct representation to the Departments, which were the artificial creation of the French Convention, though the Departments have now lived long enough to have a sort of permanent entity; not knowing exactly what to represent, they hit upon the curious idea of representing the French Communes. Now, what is a Commune? If you travel through the country you see from time to time on the horizon a spire, or a tower—it is the old church. If you get nearer you will see on some little square opposite the church the *mairie*, which is not seldom adorned with the tricolor flag. Three or four houses with gardens will mark the places where live the chief landholders, and, if the place is a little important, sometimes the notary, with the two gilt *panonceaux* over his door; all the other houses are the homes of the peasantry. This Commune has its little municipal council and its mayor; and the mayor is named by the prefect, and can be chosen outside of the municipal council. Of such Communes there are as many as 36,000 all over the country, their population varying from a few hundred souls to the two million or more which represent the population of Paris. Now, in a country where equality has become the ruling passion, imagine a system of representation which gives the same importance to the poor little hamlet lost in the solitude and to the capital, and you will have the system which has become the basis of the Senatorial elections. And what is still more extraordinary, this political importance was given to the Commune just after the movement which had made the name of "Commune" synonymous with rebellion and crime. Each Commune, however, was allowed the right of naming a senatorial elector, and while the discussion of any political subject is strictly forbidden inside of the municipal councils, these delegates were entrusted with the nomination of the Senators, of the legislators of the country.

The first act was therefore the nomination of the delegates. In most of the 760 Communes of the Department of the Oise, which I had selected as the theatre of my observations, the municipal councils chose their mayors for delegates. The proportion of the mayors who were named to those who were not was 87 per cent.; and in the instances which seemed to mark an opposition between the councils and the mayors must be classed a few cases of sick mayors who could not well travel to the *chef-lieu* of the Department, and a few cases of absent mayors. The day of the election the delegates started in various directions for Beauvais, some in their own carriages, some by the special trains which had been provided for them by the railway companies. As soon as they arrived at Beauvais they found themselves in a sort of political paradise. Obliging friends were waiting for them at the station; all the councillors-general were there in attendance; they had provided for rooms and for meals at the little hotels of the place. Men came from all sides and very politely handed them electoral tickets. I noticed that the good country mayors never refused anything; they took every ticket which was offered them and placed them with much care in their pockets. They resorted to the lodgings which had been prepared for them, took breakfast, and then made their way on foot to the court-house, a charming building in the best Renaissance style, which stands just opposite the magnificent and, alas! unfinished cathedral of the Middle Ages. In the court-house was the prefect, with his staff of sub-prefects and *conseillers de préfecture*. How polite and amiable they all were! How they shook hands with the good country electors! The prefect, however, was only a witness of the ceremony. The electoral proceedings, according to the terms of the law, were to take place under the supervision of the president of the court, so as to give a sort of judicial dignity to them. Many conversations took place before the proceedings began. The Government had very honestly refused to have official candidates—that is to say, nobody was allowed to give himself out as such, or to sign himself on the placards, as was the fashion in the Imperial times, "*M. X—, candidat du Gouvernement*." The Administration could not help, however, having its favorites, and the prefect and the sub-prefects were free to re-

commend them individually to the delegates whom they personally knew, or who asked for their advice.

The Department of the Oise contains only two very important personages, who both have much influence as landowners; one is the Duc d'Aumale, the proprietor of Chantilly; the other is the Duc de Mouchy, the proprietor of Mouchy, now allied to the Bonapartes by his marriage with the handsome Princess Murat. The Duc d'Aumale, who has completely devoted himself to his important military duties, is still the President of the Council General of the Department, and as such he had come to Beauvais on the day of the election. The Duc de Mouchy being under forty could not offer himself as senator; but he had composed his list of three Bonapartists—a country gentleman, a colonel of the army, and an ex-deputy of the Empire. The Duc d'Aumale had made no list; for, being in cordial sympathy with the existing Government, he had said that he would give his support to the list of the Administration. The Republicans had made their own list, and, as they are not strong in the Department of the Oise, they had taken two names from the Government list, and simply added as their own nominee Colonel d'Andlau, the author of the famous book on the capitulation of Metz. This was not bad policy on their part, as it was the publication of this book which rendered necessary the judgment of Marshal Bazaine; it was, therefore, not easy for the Duc d'Aumale, who had been obliged to pass judgment on Bazaine, to make much opposition to Colonel d'Andlau. Everybody in Paris expected a large return of votes for the Bonapartist list; neither the Duke nor the Administration had done any canvassing or made any agitation in the Department, while the Duc de Mouchy and his partisans had been moving heaven and earth. The Duc de Mouchy was seen everywhere shaking hands with all the country mayors, and, as he is personally much liked, he received everywhere marks of public sympathy. The vote took place in great silence and with much solemnity. Each delegate was called by name, and dropped his carefully-folded paper into the urn. When the numbers were read, it was found that two candidates of the Administration were elected; the candidate who came third was Colonel d'Andlau, but he had not an absolute majority. The Bonapartists were out of the race. A second balloting took place, and this time Colonel d'Andlau was elected. The election of the Oise, therefore, ended in a complete defeat of the Bonapartists in one of the most Conservative departments of France. They have been more successful in other places, but many of their leaders have been defeated. On the whole, they have been disappointed in their expectations, and they now exclaim against what they call the "restricted" suffrage, and make an appeal to universal suffrage, of which they profess to be the only apostles.

It is very difficult to say with any precision what our new Senate will be. If it were not for the seventy-five life-members who were named by the late Assembly, the majority would belong to those who style themselves Constitutionalists—men who have accepted the present constitution, but who have not been Republicans before. There are ninety-seven of such Constitutionalists on the list I have before me, and I can only find thirty Republicans proper—men who were always attached to the Republic. There are not more than forty Bonapartists, and I give this name to those candidates who spoke in their circulars of the revision of the constitution and of the direct appeal to the people. The Republicans will command about one hundred and forty votes, but will not have a working majority. The Constitutionalists will have about one hundred votes. It is quite clear that in all questions affecting the actual republican constitution the Bonapartists will be completely crushed; but, in those questions which may be called social, they will be able to throw themselves on the side of the Constitutionalists or conservatives, and will help them keep the advanced Republicans in check. In all personal questions affecting the existence of a Cabinet they will play fast and loose, as they did in the late Assembly.

If we look only at the great features of the situation, it cannot be denied that the Bonapartist party has been defeated, and this proves that the country is not alarmed at the present state of things. The chief reason of its calm and confidence is not, as Gambetta and his friends would like the world to believe, the existence of the Republic; it is the tenure of power of Marshal MacMahon—a man known by his energy, his devotion to his duty, and his determination not to allow any disorder. So long as there is no direct conflict between the Executive and the Chambers, the country at large will work, enjoy its repose, and care little for the small tempests in the glass of ministerial life.

According to the present constitution, there is now a double responsibility—the responsibility of the President, of the chief of the Executive, and the responsibility of the ministers. The ministers are not merely the clerks of the President. Hitherto they have been chosen in the Chamber, and have represented the majority of the day. The time may come when

the President may refuse to govern according to the dictates of this majority, and may choose his ministers outside of it. Such a conflict arose in 1849 between Louis Napoleon, who was then Prince President, and the then Chamber. The French people are reassured by the idea that the Marshal will not be the mere tool of the Chambers, and perhaps this belief tends to increase the strength of the Republican party; for it is generally felt that even in case the Upper Chamber should become the citadel of M. Thiers and the Lower Chamber the citadel of Gambetta, the Marshal, as chief of the army and President, would still remain in the citadel of his own prerogative, and would not give way to the pressure of the radical party. The Marshal considers himself as a soldier on duty, who has been charged with the defence of order. He is stubborn, self-willed, and tenacious. He has strong dislikes, and he has just shown it by removing from the Prefecture of Police M. Léon Renault merely because M. Renault accepted, in the Department where he is now a candidate for the Lower Chamber, the patronage of a M. Valentin, who was made prefect at Lyons by M. Thiers. The Marshal's objection to M. Valentin does not arise from this last fact, but merely from the fact that in 1848 Valentin was a sergeant in the army and joined the insurgents against the established government of Louis Philippe. "Mauvais soldat," says one of the actors of the "Grande Duchesse" in speaking of another. In the eyes of MacMahon, Valentin is and will always remain the "mauvais soldat."

As there is no dispute now as to the form of government, personal considerations and questions have become all-important, and it is somewhat difficult to judge them at a distance. I will not deny that the administration of the Marshal, under the Duc de Broglie and under M. Buffet, has committed mistakes, sometimes gross mistakes; but, on the whole, I believe that the rule of an honest and determined soldier, who insists in every case upon the strict enforcement of the law, who does not coquet with ambitious or corrupt politicians, has been a great benefit to a country which had just gone through the greatest misfortunes. After the war, after the Commune, a strong hand was a necessity, and it will probably remain so for a while.

Correspondence.

MAJOR ANDERSON AT FORT SUMTER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Surprised by the view of Major Anderson's conduct presented in the 'Reminiscences of Forts Sumter and Moultrie in 1860-61' by General Doubleday, noticed in your issue of the 10th inst., I looked up and have had copied for you the enclosed letters from Major Anderson, written during that period, and never before published. They certainly agree perfectly with your own theory, that "it is difficult to see how in such a trying case, without precedent or instructions, an officer could have pursued a different course from that adopted by Major Anderson—namely, to remain passive until his fort was attacked, and then to defend himself as well as his small force and scanty supplies would allow; meanwhile to leave politics to the Administration at Washington." I suppose all who knew Major Anderson will agree that, whatever may have been his defects of character, want of sincerity was not among them. He was indeed a perfectly sincere and modest man, of simple and earnestly religious character, as these letters, written under circumstances which brought out that trait in his character, to the rector of the Episcopal Church at Trenton, N. J., of which he was a member, abundantly show.

It may be well to add that that clergyman, the Rev. Dr. Richard Bache Duane, my very dear friend, who died in December last, and by whose will I came into possession of these letters, was an ardent Union man. He kept no copies of the letters to which those now sent you reply; but, from my knowledge of him, I know very well that there was nothing in them to which Major Anderson could so respond, unless he too was heartily loyal to the Government and cause he served.

The father of Dr. Duane, referred to in one of the letters, was the late Hon. William J. Duane, Secretary of the Treasury under General Jackson, and himself the son of "Duane of the Aurora." So that, descended as he was through his mother, a Bache, from Benjamin Franklin, Dr. Duane came naturally by his patriotism.—I am, yours faithfully,

HOWARD POTTER.

NEW YORK, February 25, 1876.

No. 1.

FT. MOULTRIE, S. C., Dec. 19, 1860.

MY DEAR FRIEND: God grant that you may never be placed in a posi-

tion so full of responsibility and apparently so entirely cut off from all prospect of human relief as the one I am now in. Until such be the case you can never realize how cheering, how consoling and bracing, such a letter as yours is to me. Were it not for my firm reliance upon and trust in our Heavenly Father, I could not but be disheartened; but I feel that I am here in the performance of a solemn duty, and am assured that He, who has shielded me when death claimed his victims all around me, will not desert me now. . . . A word or two about my position, etc. As soon as I had time to inspect my position and ascertain the feeling and temper of the people here, I found that to enable me to comply with my orders to defend this Fort, it was absolutely necessary that more troops and ordnance stores must be sent, and I recommended that they should be sent at once. The Government has, as you see it stated, declined for prudential reasons to send them, and I must now do the best I can.

This Fort is a very weak one in its capability of being defended. It is surrounded by houses which I cannot burn or destroy until I am certain that I am to be attacked, and I shall not be certain of it until the S. Carolinians are in position; but I have so little ammunition that I cannot waste it in destroying houses. And again, within 160 yards from the walls are piles of sand hills, some of them higher than our Fort, which will give the best and safest shelter for sharpshooters, who may pick off, in a short time, our Band of 60 men—all we have. Now, my dear sir, do you not think that this is rather a gloomy picture? And yet were you to see this little Band, to note how zealously they attend to any duty I require of them—frequently voluntarily engaging in some work which they know I wish executed—how entirely they refrain from drinking, you would see that they are men who, in the hour of trial, would do their duty. For myself, I can say frankly and truthfully that I have not had a moment of despondency. I feel that He who made me will guide me through any trials that may be in store for me, and that should it be His will that I should fall, He will be a Protector to my wife and a Father to my children. Be assured that your kindness in sending me such an encouraging, sustaining epistle will never be forgotten by

Your friend,

ROBERT ANDERSON.

No. 2.

FT. SUMTER, S. C., Dec. 30, 1860.

MY DEAR SIR: Your most welcome letter of the 26th December, received to-day, finds me, as you see, at Fort Sumter. God has been pleased to hear our prayers, and has removed me to this stronghold. Perhaps at the very moment you were writing to me I was, by his guidance, leading my little band across to this place. I left Fort Moultrie between five and six p.m., and had my command here by eight o'clock the same evening. You say that you had marvelled that I had not been ordered to hold Fort Sumter instead of Fort Moultrie. Much has been said about my having come here on my own responsibility. Unwilling to see my little band sacrificed, I determined, after calmly awaiting instructions as long as I could, to avail myself of the earliest opportunity of extricating myself from my dangerous position. God be praised! He gave me the will and led me in the way. How I do wish that you could have looked down upon us when we threw the "Stars and Stripes" to the breeze at 12 o'clock on the 29th! Our chaplain thanked God for having brought us from our place of danger, and prayed for our country, that that flag might long continue to wave over a united and happy people. The flag was then raised, the command presenting arms, and the band playing "The Star-spangled Banner," after which three cheers were given for the flag and three for the Union. It was to me a solemn, and to all a most interesting, ceremony. Thank my kind friends in —, who feel an interest in my welfare; especially my young friend —, who so kindly remembered me. I am now, thank God! in a place which will, by His helping, soon be made so strong that the S. Carolinians will be madmen if they attack me. There are some alterations and some additions which I wish to have made. The Gov'r of this State has interdicted all intercourse with the city, except that of sending and receiving letters, so that, you see, we are quasi-enemies. Were I disposed to declare myself independent of, to secede from, the General Gov't, and retaliate, I could cut Charleston off from her supplies; but I will show him that I am more of a Christian than to make the innocent suffer for the petty conduct of their governor.

I rec'd a letter to-day from my poor wife. The first news of my movement she heard in N. Y. was, "Fort Moultrie is taken." It was enough to have killed her.

God bless you and yours.

Yours aff'y,

ROBERT ANDERSON.

You see it stated that I came here without orders. Fear not; I am sure I can satisfy any tribunal I may be brought before that I was fully justified in moving my command.

No. 3.

FORT SUMTER, S. C., Jan. 16, 1861.

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter of 9th inst. has given me very great satisfaction and pleasure. Do present me, if you please, most gratefully and affectionately, to your venerable Father, and assure him that I was deeply moved by reading your statement of the manner in which he received the news of my movement. In reference to the incidents connected with that move, I can only say now that in the main the statement you sent me is sufficiently near the truth. Had I time, I might enter rather more fully into the manner in which I ordered things, so as to deceive the South Carolinians, and even to blind my own men, as to the steps I was about to take; for everything depended upon secrecy, and anything calculated to draw

suspicion towards my acts might, probably would, have caused a failure. But God, to whom I appealed, showed me the way and gave me the will to execute it. To Him be all power and praise.

I trust that He will so order it that I shall be spared the cruel necessity of being engaged in strife against our fellow-countrymen. All my endeavors, all my prayers, so far as the public is concerned, are directed to that end.

I am in daily expectation of news from Washington, where you see I have two of my officers, who were sent on with my despatches.

Begging you still to remember me and my little command in your prayers,

I am, as ever,

Yours affectionately,

ROBERT ANDERSON.

No. 4.

FORT SUMTER, S. C., March 11, 1861.

MY DEAR FRIEND: Yours of February 21 was received in due time, but I have been so constantly occupied that I could not make my acknowledgments to you for it sooner.

It seems that this is still to be a point of interest. I thought that the policy of the new Administration would have been developed by this time. The occupancy of this work, and the fact that a demand would be made by the Southern Confederacy for my withdrawal, were facts well known to all. I presume, however, that persons who are not in power make up their minds as to what *ought* to be done much more readily and upon slighter data than the same persons newly placed in office. The question of reinforcing is one that is very easily determined upon, but, when the *how* is it to be done? and how many lives will it cost? are examined, the matter is of much greater difficulty than it was thought to be. You have had very many rumors about us which were wholly untrue. With the exception of my having added considerably to our defensive means, no change of any consequence has been made in the command. I am still doing something every day, and shall probably, should we be unattacked a month longer, make some changes every week.

The S. Carolinians continue working very energetically, building new batteries or strengthening those already built. They will certainly be ready to pour a very heavy storm of shot and of shells upon us; but, trusting in God, I have no fear of the result. He has been pleased to scatter a much larger force than these people can muster, and His arm has lost nothing of its strength.

My own impression is that when Mr. Lincoln and his cabinet examine into the question of my position they will decide that it is useless to keep me here. My position is an interior one; and the entrance of the harbor is *not* at all guarded by my guns, but *is* by heavy batteries which are *not* under the fire of my guns.

I do not worry myself about these questions. They are not for me to discuss or to decide, and I know that God will order all things aright, and I am content with that knowledge.

I thank you, most earnestly, for your prayers. I hear from many sources that we are remembered in prayer, both public and private, and I thank God for His continued mercies to us, and pray that He will be pleased to unite us, if not as one people to make us *one* in our love and adoration of Him. When I reflect upon what has been passing around us during the last ten years, I sometimes feel that we have strayed so far from God's paths that He will chasten us with the rod of His power; but, then, when I reflect upon His mercies, I hope that He may spare us, a people, and that we will repent and turn to Him.

Please still remember me in your prayers. I need them.

God bless you and yours.

Yours faithfully and affly,

ROBERT ANDERSON.

Notes.

THE *American Naturalist* states that H. O. Houghton & Co., of the Riverside Press, will shortly publish, with explanatory letterpress, a series of sketches of the wild flowers of North America, from studies by the well-known botanical artist, Mr. Isaac Sprague.—Mr. Joaquin Miller has found a happy title for his prose romance, which Jansen, McClurg & Co., Chicago, are to publish, viz., 'The First Families of the Sierras.' It is a story of miner life in California.—An acute writer, Mr. James Thompson Bixby, has written a work called 'The Similarities of Physical and Religious Knowledge,' of which D. Appleton & Co. will be the publishers.—The appointment of a superintendent of the Astor Library is of no little importance to the reading public of this city. The *World's* suggestion of Mr. James Carson Brevoort as a fit candidate for that place is an excellent one, and we hope it will find favor with the trustees. Mr. Brevoort's private library is the largest and, we believe we may say, the most comprehensive in Brooklyn, and his knowledge of books, both special and general, is very great.—Deserved attention has been given by Dr. Elliott Coues, U.S.A., in the Bulletin of the United States Geological and Geographical Survey of the Territories (No. 6, Second Series), to the various publications relating to the classic travels of Lewis and Clarke. He traces to three sources some twenty editions, "authentic, abridged, spurious, or collateral," and gives the most complete bibliography

of the whole subject ever attempted, though he constantly expresses his indebtedness to Mr. Thomas W. Field for his previous labors in the same direction. This interesting *exposé* of the bookmaker's art is followed by a review of Lewis and Clarke's contributions to zoology in respect of mammals and birds. Dr. Coues indicates all the passages in which each species is described, the diversity of scientific names which have since been applied to them, which of these were based on the explorers' descriptions, and to which of them priority of nomenclature is due. This also is excellently well done. The curious doubt which hangs over the spelling of Captain Clarke's name is recognized on p. 426, and the conclusion is reached that "the balance of evidence is in favor of 'Clarke.'"—Mr. Joseph Sabin's latest monograph, extracted from his 'Dictionary of Books relating to America,' is a 'List of the Editions of the Works of Louis Hennepin and Alonso de Herrera,' pp. 16. The 'Dictionary' itself has now forty printed parts, numbering 32,000 titles, and six more parts are expected to appear this year, the MS. being, as we understand, advanced to the letter K. Even at this stage the work deserves a prominent place in our Centennial show of national literature.—J. W. Bouton announces the 'Works of William Unger,' being seventy etchings by this admirable artist after the old Dutch and Flemish masters, with English text. There will be ten parts, royal folio, at \$7 each.—A handy little fortnightly, *Gazette anecdotique, littéraire, artistique et bibliographique*, has been begun with the year at the Librairie des Bibliophiles, Paris (New York: F. W. Christern). It has a very attractive typography.

—When we published, week before last, a letter signed "N. N.," comparing Smith College at Northampton with Girton College at Cambridge, England, considerably to the advantage of the former, we had not seen its prospectus, and had no knowledge of it ourselves. This we have since received, and have made some enquiries, which render it necessary to say that "N. N.'s" letter was in many respects misleading. Smith College was only opened in September, 1875, so that nothing whatever can be asserted with any confidence as to the character of the education it will afford. The faculty, if it be now complete, is composed of persons who have still their reputation to make as university instructors, and it is, therefore, improper to compare them in any way with the lecturers or examiners at Girton College. Moreover, as nobody has ever graduated at Smith College, it is manifestly absurd, if not worse, to say that it gives as good an education as can be had at Harvard or Yale. All that "N. N." was entitled to say on this subject was, that he hoped or expected that it would do so. In fact, the institution is as yet simply a mass of promises. We find, too, that the domestic arrangements and the discipline, as described in the prospectus, are by no means like those of Girton, and are evidently adapted to younger and less formed students than those of Girton. In short, we must pronounce Smith College to be another small, feebly-endowed, and insufficiently-equipped college, added to the host of those which in all parts of the country are doing so much injury to the cause of the higher education in the United States. We would earnestly urge the friends of collegiate instruction for women to refrain from the expenditure of money in this way, and to devote themselves, if possible, to procuring for female students the benefits of the existing educational machinery, by creating, if possible, halls attached to the older universities, and obtaining a share in their instruction and the use of their standards, without resorting to the device called "coeducation." The country does not contain the talent or learning necessary to man any more universities in the existing state of the profession. The older colleges know this well, and the new ones should not pretend that they have discovered any hidden treasures.

—The death of Horace Bushnell, which occurred on Feb. 17, is an event in the intellectual, and not merely in the theological, world. For more than twenty years he was an invalid, disabled from professional labor, and compelled to desist from exciting toil; but in this discouraging condition he sent out some of his best productions—'Sermons for the New Life,' 'Nature and the Supernatural,' 'Work and Play,' 'Christ and His Salvation,' 'The Vicarious Sacrifice,' 'The Moral Uses of Dark Things,' 'Woman Suffrage, the Reform against Nature,' 'Sermons on Living Subjects,' and 'Forgiveness and Law'—eight volumes, some of which were composed entirely of new material. In this way, and by his power of personal character, he kept himself alive in retirement, and was an intellectual force while invisible. Dr. Bushnell was primarily, by the structure of his mind, a theologian, and would have shown the theological bias in any calling he might have pursued, even in journalism or law, had he followed either of those callings, as he proposed to do and for a short time did. His actual ministry, which began late and ended early, occupying

but twenty-five years out of seventy-four, could hardly have created the pre disposition that was so strong in him. He was a theologian, too, of the grand type. The end he had in view was the reconciliation of theology with the primal instincts of human nature. The points he presented and discussed were: the claims of nurture as distinguished from conversion; the human motive and necessity of the Incarnation; the unexceptional character of the Atonement; and the naturalness of the supernatural. These points he made with great ability and brilliancy, in a style original in its piquancy, with remarkable subtlety of definition and variety of illustration. Thirty years ago he was the most conspicuous figure in our ecclesiastical world. He had disciples in all the divinity schools, and even founded a school of his own, equivalent, within orthodox Congregationalism, to the Broad Church of the F. D. Maurice school in England. It is probable, however, that he did as much to weaken orthodoxy as to strengthen it; his interpretations were not welcomed by the authorities, who suspected him of heresy, and put him on his defence. He was more than a match for them, and yet their suspicions that he weakened the faith rather than confirmed it were not unreasonable. Dr. Bushnell's most characteristic work, on the whole, the work that displays the full peculiarity of his mind, is that on Woman Suffrage. It is a volume of equal size with Mill's book on the same subject, written in an equal spirit of reverence for woman. Dr. Bushnell dedicates his book to his wife in terms as glowing as those used by Mill in his former dedication of 'Liberty.' Yet the two reasoners arrive at opposite conclusions. Bushnell's antipathy to the movement was deep and earnest. He would not even consent that the experiment of suffrage should be tried. But his candor appears in his frank admission, in this book, that on other points connected with the general subject his views have undergone decided changes.

—The Johns Hopkins University was formally instituted at Baltimore on the 22d of February, in the presence of a remarkable company, which included a German-like representation of the heads and leading professors of other universities. President Eliot, of Harvard, made what was playfully characterized as the baptismal address, and was followed immediately by President Gilman, who in a long discourse unfolded, as definitely as was possible, the condition of the University's endowment and the plans agreed upon or under consideration by the trustees. He first showed that Mr. Hopkins's bequest, unparalleled as it was, really enabled the University to begin life only in very moderate circumstances. Half of the seven millions goes to a hospital, half to the University, and the income on the latter (\$200,000) is but little more than the annual expense of Harvard, whose "plant" is estimated at five millions. Out of this income, too, the future buildings have to be provided for, and it is therefore clear that unless fresh endowments are forthcoming, the University must content itself with a very gradual development. Its scope and methods, as next set forth, were substantially foreshadowed in the *Nation* a year ago (No. 500). President Gilman did not distinctly formulate what is still evidently to some extent *sub judice*, but he let it be inferred that elementary instruction in all branches of science is not contemplated at the new University. There will be no stated curriculum of four years. Great freedom is to be allowed both to teachers and to scholars; the former must be "free and competent to make original researches in the library and the laboratory"; the latter will be encouraged to "make special attainments on the foundation of a broad and liberal culture," and to make them through a "combination of lectures, recitations, laboratory practice, field work, and private instruction." Pending the filling of the several professorial chairs, the trustees will ask distinguished professors from other colleges to come to Baltimore during a term of years and reside there an appointed time, "and be accessible, *publice et privatim*, both in the lecture-room and in the study." But two appointments have thus far been made, viz., Prof. Gildersleeve, of the University of Virginia, to the chair of Greek; and Prof. Sylvester, of England, to that of mathematics. The order in which the departments will be built up was presented at some length. The foundation of the hospital makes it natural and probable that instruction in the biological sciences will receive early attention from the trustees of the University.

—Mr. James T. Gardner, in his report to the American Geographical Society on "the uses of a topographical survey to the State of New York," has given due prominence to the economical value of such a survey, and points out very forcibly the loss which the want of it entails upon property-holders. He says "there can be no proper valuation of real estate, hence no equalization of taxation, until the State is provided with a correct map of its entire public and private property." As under the present system there can be no accurate maps, the assessment rolls are made up largely by guessing, and since it is each man's interest to pay taxes on as few acres as

possible, the aggregate area of taxable real estate is constantly shrinking, so that Mr. Gardner estimates that now one-tenth of the whole escapes taxation altogether. For instance, in Queens County in 1864 the assessors' books gave only 182,000 acres, while the maps showed 253,000 acres. The facts that he brings forward to support this statement, as revealed by recent special surveys made in different towns and cities, are conclusive as to the injustice of the present system upon the taxpayer. In Yonkers, 525 acres, worth \$260,000, were brought under taxation by the new survey, and it was found that some persons were paying taxes on as much as forty acres more or less than they possessed. In Newport, R. I., only four men were found to be properly taxed upon their real estate; ten men were paying assessment on \$579,000 instead of \$280,000, while ten others were only taxed on \$450,000, when their property was really worth \$700,000. In the matter of equalizing taxation alone, the survey would be a measure of great economy for the taxpayers of the State. By its survey the town of Yonkers reduced its tax \$4,000 per annum, and, at the same rate for the whole State, the saving would be \$3,200,000 annually, the interest of which amount would be sufficient to carry on such a survey as Mr. Gardner proposes. It is evident, on the other hand, that Yonkers pays the penalty of striving to obtain greater accuracy in its town taxation by being obliged to bear a proportionately larger burden of the State taxes.

—As another result of the present system, or rather want of system, Mr. Gardner states that "hardly in one case in a thousand do the deeds in the State of New York describe correctly the area of real estate conveyed." So general a statement might appear exaggerated to any one but real-estate lawyers or surveyors, who have constant proof of its truth. A case is quoted where a man about to sell his seventy-acre lot was induced to have a new survey made, by which it was found to contain eighty-seven acres; and another where an owner, upon subdividing a lot of land purchased for fifty acres, found that actual measurement gave him only forty acres. Such inaccuracies arise from the want of permanent imperishable monuments, the trees or stones which were used as points of reference when land was of little value having in general disappeared, and their position been since determined by the shrewd guess of some more or less disinterested person. A properly conducted survey should not only provide monuments that will last for all time as guides to property boundaries, but also furnish to every one at a low price an authentic map of his property and its relations to that of his neighbors. The maps of the Ordnance Survey of Great Britain, for instance, which are sold at a shilling or two a sheet, not only furnish accurate information about the surface features of the country but give the boundaries of a man's farm in the country or his lot in the city, and the points of reference determined by them constitute a final standard in cases of disputed boundaries. The saving which an official survey of this State, conducted on scientific principles by men whose position and reputation should place them above the influence of local interests, would make in the costs of litigation, which increase even faster than the value of property, can hardly be estimated. What these costs may amount to can be inferred from the case cited of a lawsuit now pending in New York City where five surveyors are employed to determine the right ownership of three inches of land. The maps of such a survey should give an accurate delineation of the surface-features of the country, which would serve as a basis for laying out such public works as the water-supplies for towns and factories, and drainage systems for improving the health of marshy districts and increasing the value of agricultural lands. The work should be entrusted to a man whose experience, scientific attainments, and natural ability would fit him to direct it and train up a corps of assistants. It would require probably fifteen years for its accomplishment, and the cost, though very considerable, would fall short of what is actually expended by special surveys, which only accomplish a part of its results. This cost would fall heaviest upon the more thickly settled regions, where the accruing advantages would be greater; to the farmer it would not be more than ten cents per acre.

—A correspondent of *Notes and Queries* has been tracing the origin of Macaulay's New Zealander. He finds in the *Monthly Review*, 1780, lxii, 128, a notice of 'Poems by a young nobleman of distinguished abilities, lately deceased, particularly the State of England, and the once flourishing City of London. In a letter from an American traveller, dated from the ruinous portico of St. Paul's, in the year 2199, to a friend settled in Boston, the metropolis of the Western Empire.' Mr. Bartlett has already shown that besides the use of the image three times by Macaulay himself, something very similar is to be found in Volney's 'Ruins,' Henry Kirke White's 'Time,' Shelley's dedication to 'Peter Bell,' and in a letter of Horace Walpole's to Mason, dated Nov. 24, 1774, from which last Macaulay is generally supposed to have derived it. The correspondent of *Notes*

and *Queries* now brings forward another claimant—and this time a foreigner. In 'L'An Deux Mille Quatre Cent Quarante: Rêve s'il en fut jamais' there is a vision which treats in like manner of a wanderer amid the ruins of Versailles. An English edition of this book appeared in London in 1773, a year before the date of Walpole's letter, and seven years, therefore, before the publication of the supposed visit of the Bostonian to the ruins of London, where "a poor emaciated Briton, who officiates as cicerone, is his attendant." It is curious to note that the self-styled Bostonian's book was published during the American War.

—We are very glad to extend a hand of welcome to the new *Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'Étranger*, edited by Th. Ribot, and to be published monthly by Germer Baillière (New York: F. W. Christern). M. Ribot is a most painstaking and enthusiastic student of the science of man, and his abridgments of the labors of English and German philosophers and physiologists have probably had no small share in the promising revival of psychological studies which we now see in France. The programme of his review is catholic enough. Kantians and inheritors of Cousin may contribute to its columns on the same terms as Comtists and experimentalists—individual responsibility namely, and the obligation of saying something novel. Even from metaphysicians "facts will be required." This temper compares pleasantly with that of certain persons in England and with us, who are as great friends of evolution and of physiological methods as M. Ribot, but whose own evolution upwards from theological beginnings seems to have stopped short at the stage of inarticulate joy over their emancipation; and for whom every piece of writing is good whose pages are speckled over with words like "body," "ganglion-cell," "brute ancestor," "visceral emotion," whilst the sight of a term like "soul," "design," or "free will" in a book affects them with a sort of foaming at the mouth. In this first number of the *Revue Philosophique* M. Taine and M. Janet stand shoulder to shoulder, the latter discoursing of final causes, for which, as usual, he is a more fluent than original apologist; and the former giving an entertaining diary of the way his child learned to talk, and finding in his observations a corroboration of Max Müller's theories. This child created several words for its own use. The sound *ham* was uttered by it at fourteen months.

"For some weeks I took it for mere babbling, but at last I saw that it invariably occurred when the child was fed. The child now is sure to utter it when hungry or thirsty. . . . If we listen attentively and try to reproduce the sound, we see it to be the *natural vocal gesture* of a person catching something in his mouth. It begins by a guttural aspirate not unlike a bark, and ends by the lips closing as if the food were seized and swallowed. . . . Now the family uses the word like the child. Originality, invention are so lively with it, that if it learns our language, we also learn from it its own."

The bibliographic part of the review is both extensive and conscientious. The list of articles soon to be published contains many relative to recent German psychology. As this important matter is little known among us many persons may be glad of this second-hand and easy introduction to it. It is confidently asserted in Germany that the new science of "psychophysics," the outcome of laboratories, and the creation of such physicists as Wundt, Helmholtz, and Fechner, is but a brilliant commentary on the deductive conclusions of the idealistic philosophers of that country. Not only is the intellect not built up of sensations, says the new science, but a pure sensation is a nonentity; what we call sensation is soaked through with intellect, and the result of complex logical inference. We do not vouch for the truth of this interpretation of the experimental facts, but we have said enough to show philosophical students of even the most conservative type that they possibly may lose more than they save by giving physiological methods the cold shoulder.

—In 1872 Domenico Comparetti, the distinguished Italian scholar, published a work entitled 'Virgilio nel Medio Evo,' which was received with the greatest favor in Italy and elsewhere. Although a work of general interest, it has now for the first time been made more accessible to students by a German translation ('Virgil im Mittelalter von D. Comparetti. Aus dem Italienischen übersetzt von Hans Dütschke.' Leipzig: Teubner, 1875). We say more accessible, though it seems paradoxical that a stranger to both languages should find German the easier; but, apart from the fact that German literature attracts far more students than does the Italian, the German translator has, by omitting reprints of rare texts, etc., of no value to the general reader, reduced the original two volumes to one octavo volume. The first part treats of "Virgil in Literature to the Time of Dante," and is an exhaustive essay on the vicissitudes of the Latin poet, during the Middle Ages, in the hands of the grammarians, commentators, and Christian fathers. In fulness of details Comparetti far exceeds all who have heretofore treated this attractive theme. It is interesting to follow the

author's luminous account of the *literary* changes in the character of Virgil from the time of Servius to the allegorical exposition of Fulgentius. Although the *sortes Virgilianæ* were employed under the Antonines, and the writer of the Fourth Eclogue was early regarded as having a prophetic foresight of the coming Christ, it is remarkable that, to the time of Dante, no suspicion of magic attached to Virgil. That interesting transformation is due entirely to the popular traditions of Naples. It is seldom that a myth can be traced so clearly in its rise and diffusion. The author follows it from Naples in its spread over Italy and the rest of Europe, giving in the second part ("Virgil in Popular Tradition") a mass of interesting details. One or two additional traditions from Sicily may be found in Pitrè's collection (see *Nation*, No. 528), vol. ii., p. 13-17.

—Few historians of Florence have cared to follow the fate of that commonwealth under the Grand-Dukes. Napier does so in his history in a somewhat hasty way, and there are native historians (among them Galluzzi and the incomplete Ammirato) who continue their works to the extinction of the Medici. Capponi, on the other hand, whose death is already to be lamented, ends his fresh labors with the fall of Florentine liberty in 1531. The student will find a dearth of good histories of this period, and will be grateful to the indefatigable Alfred von Reumont, who had scarcely finished his great work on 'Lorenzo de' Medici' when he began a history of Tuscany since the Florentine Republic. His work forms part of the invaluable 'Geschichte der europäischen Staaten' of Heeren, Ukert, and Giesebrecht, and bears the separate title: 'Geschichte Toscana's seit dem Ende des florentinischen Freistaates' (Gotha, 1876). It is a first instalment, and contains the history of Tuscany under the Medicean Grand-Dukes from 1530-1737. The volume is provided with a chronological table, bibliography of works relating to this period, and a genealogical chart. The purely historical details are relieved by chapters on the state of literature, science, and art, in which the author's profound knowledge finds a congenial outlet. Everything that Von Reumont writes about Italy is sure to be accurate and interesting, and the present volume, it seems to us, possesses these qualities to an unusual degree.

—Several German publications which lie upon our table either speak for themselves, or require but a brief introduction to our readers. First of these is 'Das Aencien Régime in Canada,' the German version of Francis Parkman's well-known work bearing that title, and one of August Auerbach's American series (Stuttgart) to which we so lately alluded. It makes an octavo volume of 333 pages, uniform with the 'Pioneers of France,' previously issued by the same house. A third volume of Mr. Parkman's is announced as in preparation—the 'Jesuits in North America.'—'Die Urne' (Leipzig: C. G. Theile) is an annual of universal necrology, edited by Dr. Hugo Schramm-Macdonald. The volume before us is the first; it covers the years 1873-74, and is adorned with a portrait of the late King of Saxony. It classifies the dead first according to their station or profession, and then according to their nationality; and the biographical details, the anecdotes, etc., tempt the reader to go through the 'Urne' as he would through any other review of the year. For ready reference, on the other hand, an alphabetical index is provided at the end of each period. The editor's design is to overcome as far as possible the inaccuracy of newspaper and telegraphic obituaries, and to furnish more trustworthy material for even the conversation lexicons. We have examined his list of the notable dead of 1873, and find that it certainly includes the greatest names. A fulness to satisfy the prejudices of every country would be impossible. Among our own countrymen, for instance, we find Judge Chase but not Judge Nelson; James L. Orr but not John P. Hale; Gen. Canby but not Gen. Meade; Agassiz but not Catlin; Powers but not Sully, etc. Under Winslow, by the way, is given in a foot-note the story of his fight with the *Alabama*, which is unqualifiedly characterized as a "pirate-ship." One excellent feature is a reference to fuller notices of the deceased in periodicals and elsewhere, as in the case of J. S. Mill. The 'Urne' decidedly takes its place beside 'Men of the Time.'—The German law of trade-marks and the exchange stamp-tax law are given textually and discussed scientifically and historically in the two last numbers (Theil III., Band I., Hefte 2, 3) of 'Die Gesetzgebung des Deutschen Reiches' (Erlangen: Palm & Encke).—A light and versatile writer, Ernst Eckstein, has had unusual success with his latest production, 'Der Besuch im Carcer' (Leipzig: J. F. Hartknoch), which has reached a fifteenth edition. It is a humorous story of the way in which a *Prisoner*, locked up for mimicking the flat and pompous speech of the Herr Director of the Gymnasium, contrives to place himself on the outside of the cell and to turn the key on his persecutor. The mystification of the janitor between the real and the counterfeit voices is very amusing. After vainly endeavoring to establish his

identity with his servant, the Director can only exclaim, despairingly but still classically, that "Mät der Dummheit kämpfen Götter selbst vergebens!" There are six clever illustrations. In one of them, out of a group of nine *Primærs*, two are represented as wearing glasses—unwitting confirmation of the statistics of Dr. Cohn, of Breslau, as to near-sightedness in the German gymnasia (31.7 per cent.)—As a continuation and complement of Kiepert's ancient and modern hand-atlases, Dr. Carl Wolff has been employed to edit an historical atlas in eighteen maps, embracing the period from A.D. 500 to 1871. The first of three parts, all of which will appear during the present year, is before us (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer; New York: L. W. Schmidt). It is strictly limited in scope to Europe, and Germany and her immediate neighbors receive most attention. In this respect, of course, as well as in the number of maps, it differs distinctly from Spruner's atlas, and while calculated to be of service even to the learned, it is designed chiefly for the use of students in the higher schools. As regards clearness and beauty of execution and accuracy, Dr. Wolff's maps compare not unfavorably with Spruner's, and by turns one feels inclined to give the palm to the Berlin establishment and to that at Gotha (Justus Perthes). Dr. Wolff, except in a few cases, preserves the national spelling for names of places, though in this he is not always consistent, e.g., Warszawa (16), Warschau (15), Warszawa (Warschau) (12), etc.

THE LIFE OF GEORGE TICKNOR.*

THIS book is likely to hold a unique place in American literature. We have had nothing like it heretofore, and we shall have nothing like it hereafter. The biographies with which it might be compared—that of Washington Irving, for instance, or that by Mr. Ticknor himself of his friend Prescott—are very different from it in quality and association. Mr. Ticknor was the most marked type of the American man of letters and society of the first half of this century, as distinguished from the mere scholar or author. He combined traits not often found so happily mingled; his strong social tastes and his brilliant social gifts did not interfere with the steadiness of his literary industry or diminish the worth of its results. He had a fortunate temperament and an easy life. He was in fortunate relations to his times, and he succeeded in securing, together with such advantages as America could afford to a man of strong moral feeling, rational desires, and genial temper, the benefits of the best culture of Europe and the charms of its best society. His biography, quite apart from its personal interest, will have a permanent value as a vivid illustration of the conditions of the most cultivated society of New England during a period of rapid national development, which even now, though so recent, seems to belong to a somewhat remote past—a period of comparative simplicity of living, of cheerful confidence in the political institutions of the country and in the moral progress of the people—a period far less various in aspect, far less perplexed with difficult political and social problems, far less unsettled than the present. In the homogeneous community of Boston—a community which had a high if somewhat narrow and provincial standard of intelligence and character—Mr. Ticknor was for many years a distinguished and original figure.

He never took a leading part in political affairs, never held political office, never was tempted outside those lines of activity which, with unusual good sense and clear discrimination of his own capacities and inclinations, he had early laid down for himself. His career was one of uncommon consistency. There is nothing dramatic in its incidents. But probably no American has led a life richer in that class of associations and interests which belong properly to literary biography, and the two volumes in which his history is told afford such varied literary entertainment, such pleasant personal anecdotes and reminiscences of so many of the most distinguished people of the time, as to form a substantial addition to the books on the shelf that holds the memoirs of Johnson, of Scott, of Mackintosh, and they may find a place, perhaps, close to the 'Life of Southey' and the 'Diary of Crabbe Robinson.' It is curiously distinguished from all its neighbors, however, in the fact of its American origin. The American portion is even more fresh and instructively entertaining than the foreign. And in this the book is the true image of Mr. Ticknor himself. He was on even terms with the best society everywhere, but he was most perfectly at home in it in his own delightful library, where to the agreeableness of a man of uncommon social accomplishments was added the gracious welcome of a most genial and ready host.

His nature was of even proportion and build, and admirably adapted to its actual surroundings. He was pre-eminently, in a good sense, a man of

the world. Alert, self-controlled, of liberal and refined taste, with many sources of enjoyment open to him, he was not exposed to the temptations of vehement passions, or to the illusions of the poetic imagination. His clear intelligence and sound moral nature were in admirable harmony. A steady sense of duty was combined in him with great sweetness of disposition. His character was based upon a strong will and moulded by strong moral principles. In the circumstances of his life he seemed a fortunate man; in great part this was due to his having learned the difficult lesson of how to compel good fortune to one's bidding.

Such a man's life would be worth reading even were his experience of less variety than that of Mr. Ticknor. The outline of his can be told in a few words. He was born of excellent parents in Boston in 1791. He was an only child, and he received every advantage of education within his father's means. After graduating at Dartmouth College, he studied law, and was admitted to the bar, but his literary tastes were so strongly pronounced that he soon determined to give himself to literary pursuits, and to this end resolved to go to Europe for purposes of study. The account given in the pages of his biography of his zeal for study, and of the difficulties he met with in attempting to learn German from the impossibility of obtaining the needful books, is a striking picture of the difference between the opportunities of sixty years ago and those of the present time. Before leaving America he made a journey to Washington and Virginia, seeing many eminent men, and meeting with a reception from them which showed that even then, at twenty-three years of age, he must have been a youth of uncommon powers of attraction, and not less uncommon acquisitions. His accounts of visits to Madison and Jefferson, his sketches of Marshall, Pinkney, John Randolph, Emmet, and others are full of interest. In the spring of 1815 he set sail for England, amply supplied with letters of introduction from Jefferson, John Adams, and other eminent men to their friends abroad, and from the moment of his landing at Liverpool and first acquaintance with Roscoe, and on his way to London with Dr. Parr, begins the series of sketches of distinguished persons whom he saw more or less familiarly wherever he went during his four years' stay abroad, and with many of whom he formed relations of life-long friendliness which were renewed during subsequent visits to Europe in later years. One of his earliest acquaintances in London was Byron. They were together one morning when a gentleman came suddenly into the room and announced the defeat of Bonaparte after a great battle in the Low Countries. "But is it true?" said Lord Byron. "Is it true?" "Yes, my lord, it is certainly true; an aide-de-camp arrived in town last night, he has been in Downing Street this morning, and I have just seen him as he was going to Lady Wellington's." He says he thinks Bonaparte is in full retreat towards Paris." After an instant's pause, Lord Byron replied: "I am d—d sorry for it."

The anecdote is a characteristic one, and the scene again reminds the reader how far 1876 is from 1815. But the pages of Mr. Ticknor's 'Diary and Letters' are full of anecdotes and narratives of conversation, of descriptions of remarkable men and women, and of unusual personal experience, which are so fresh and entertaining, so well told, and so illustrative of social habits, as to form a contribution of no slight value to our knowledge of the life of the times.

Mr. Ticknor's style was from the beginning simple and animated. He wrote with fluency and ease. His head was not turned by the flattering attentions he received at all hands, and his journals and letters are free from the conceit and egotism that too often mark productions of the sort. The freedom from extravagance of expression in the accounts of his experiences was a characteristic sign of the even balance of his temper and of his fixed habit of self-control. His sympathies, though quick, never betrayed him into enthusiasm, nor was his judgment overmastered by excitement of feeling. In August, 1815, he established himself at Göttingen, and there remained, leading a most industrious life as a student, with brief intervals of vacation, for the next twenty months. His zeal for learning, eager as it had been, was quickened and satisfied by the ample opportunities that were here afforded to him, and the time he passed at Göttingen was in some respects the most important period of his life, as that in which he acquired large stores of thorough scholarship, which, constantly augmented in future years, served as the solid basis of his later literary work, and distinguished him as one of the most accomplished students of his generation. He had special gifts for the acquisition of languages, and at Göttingen devoted himself mainly to the language and literature of Greece, of Germany, and of Italy.

From Göttingen he went to Paris, and, while continuing his studies here with great diligence, he entered freely into society, where his attractions and his abilities secured for him the acquaintance and intimacy of the per-

* 'Life, Letters, and Journals of George Ticknor.' Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1876. 2 vols. 8vo.

sons best worth knowing. Few young foreigners have had such a reception. Madame de Staël, Humboldt, Madame Récamier, Châteaubriand, Villemain, Benjamin Constant, Lafayette, and others worthy to be named with these, pass one by one before us in living presence on the pages of his journal. Our limits do not allow us to quote, as we should like, the account of the striking conversation of Madame de Staël and Châteaubriand. We can but refer our readers to Mr. Ticknor's own pages.

In Italy, in Spain, his experience was the same, everywhere welcomed by the best and most interesting people, everywhere making diligent use of his unrivalled opportunities for the observation of men and manners, while pursuing his serious studies with unrelaxed ardor. There is nowhere in literature such a picture of the society of Europe in the years immediately after the fall of Napoleon as is given to us in Mr. Ticknor's narrative.

He returned home in 1819, after four years' absence, and he came back quite unspoiled by his dangerous experience of the charms of Europe. The solidity of his character showed itself by his simple, unaffected acceptance of the conditions of life in Boston, and his adaptation of himself to the narrow limits of American society. He almost at once entered upon the duties of the Professorship of Belles Lettres and Modern Languages at Harvard College, to which he had been appointed during his absence, and applied himself with earnestness and generous zeal to the task of instruction, and to the quickening of whatever literary and scholarly taste and ambition there might be among his students. For fifteen years during which he held the professorship he sought not only to enlarge the scope and elevate the standard of literary acquirement in the College, but to promote the higher culture of the community at large. No man did more than he by the influence of example, by the liberal use of his time and knowledge, and by the generous freedom with which he placed his large and rare collection of books at the service of all who might be aided by it, to foster the love of letters and to qualify the force of the material tendencies of American life by the promotion of the better interests of intelligence. Few men have done so much for the civilization of this country. Few have been such worthy Americans.

In 1834 Mr. Ticknor again visited Europe with his family, and a large part of the volume before us is made up of the journal of the three years that he now spent abroad. Its chief interest is similar to that of the journal of his earlier residence in Europe, consisting in the clear and animated accounts of the remarkable persons with whom he was brought into relation. It is an extraordinary supplement to the earlier description, and taken as a whole gives an unparalleled view of good society forty years ago in England, in France, in Germany, and in Italy. Mr. Ticknor, it is true, had not the instinct of the imagination, and some of the chief figures of the time, living outside the conventional circle, do not appear on his pages, or, if at all, only in unsatisfactory and uncharacteristic likeness. But the very traits in Mr. Ticknor's mental disposition which limited his powers of imaginative insight, give to the mass of his notices of persons and narrative of incidents an absolute trustworthiness so far as the actual fact and the personal impression are concerned. He is seldom epigrammatic, very seldom gives a poetic touch, but writes always with good sense and constantly exhibits his strong moral sympathies. Perhaps the most remarkable passage of his experience is contained in his exceedingly interesting narrative of a series of conversations with Prince Metternich in 1833. Such a revelation of the statesman's judgment of himself and his policy has, we believe, never been made public before. But this is only one out of many passages of interest.

It was after returning home in 1837 that Mr. Ticknor gave himself to the preparation for the press of his 'History of Spanish Literature.' For many years he had employed himself in amassing the materials required for it, and the labor upon the work was suited to his taste. The book is too well known and too highly esteemed to need fresh criticism. It is one of the most thorough and exact of literary histories, and one of the few most creditable productions of American scholarship.

During the later years of his life he was greatly interested in the establishment of the Boston Public Library, and the immediate, and what seems likely to be the lasting, success of that institution was in great measure due to his judicious counsels and active exertions. He made it in large part what it is. In its interest he visited Europe for a third and last time in 1856-7. Old and new friends clustered around him, and again wherever he went he was welcomed by the best. His last years were passed quietly at home. No one who had the privilege of knowing him there but will have a pleasant and often a grateful memory of his rich and abundant conversation, of his ready helpfulness, of his lively interests in books, in persons and affairs. He died, after a happy life, in full possession of his faculties, in the eightieth year of his age.

The 'Memoir' which is now published of him is prepared with taste, discretion, and fidelity. It is a sincere and simple presentation of a sincere and simple but remarkable character. The book, as we have said, is unique in our literature, and we could wish that when another edition is called for, some parts of merely local and temporary interest might be omitted, in order to extend its circulation, and thus to increase the influence of a life so honestly devoted to intellectual ends, of a character so exemplary in its ministry of culture and civilization.

SOME RECENT BOOKS ON GOVERNMENT.*

MR. REEMELIN'S book is hardly to be called either an essay or a treatise. It is a series of reflections on politics, of which it is not always easy to see the connection or even the drift. The chapter on the "Object of Government," to which we turned as a sort of test of the writer's aim, merely tells us that most old, and especially theological, definitions of government are incorrect; that "adequacy to the purpose in hand and consistency with the permanent welfare of society are the true measures by which to determine the amount of government to be exercised"; and that "wherever the increase or diminution of powers proceeds with least commotion, there is the healthiest public conduct, provided it is always done for sound political reasons." This, it must be admitted, is not very clear, and, in so far as we understand it, is not much more useful than the old plan for catching birds by putting salt on their tails. The chapter contains one remark of some originality—that we in this country are apt to forget that "our churches, political parties, chambers of commerce, and corporations" are part of the governmental machinery. On the subject of individual self-government the author is still less clear; for he tells us that "the two qualities through which the universe rules itself are omnipresence and omnipotence," and that, therefore, "whatever approaches nearest to an omnipresent and omnipotent guidance of individuals will be the best control over man," and that this thing is "self-government," under "the various names of religion, morals, ethics, etc." The "et cetera" in this case must cover a great deal. In fact, the book is a mass of loose thought, very obscurely expressed, with a large intermixture of pure commonplace, and we are entirely unable to detect any good reason for its appearance. We suspect that the author is a rationalist, and in the matter of morals a utilitarian, and that if he had his way he would model a state on the basis of suggestions drawn from John C. Calhoun, with the assistance of Bentham, Mill, Von Holtzendorff, Virchow, Buchez, and other writers, whom he seems to have perused in a diligent but not orderly manner; but what kind of state it would be we cannot guess.

Mr. William Giles Dix seems to be a very excitable and despondent person, who takes a very dark view both of the American state and of the American statesmen; but he says some things worth saying and remembering, though many of his sayings, it must be admitted, are a little mixed, as where he announces that a "blazing, bitter star has fallen on our American waters and mountains, on ripening fields and happy homes, spreading lurid, blasting terror, like sparks from the furnace of perdition, and the name of that star is called Federalism." It will be seen from this example that Mr. Dix is not sober in his rhetoric, and that his mind is in a somewhat inflamed condition. One of his chapters is a glowing eulogy on Mr. Sumner; another is devoted to maintaining, apropos of Mr. Sumner, the thesis that a United States senator represents the whole Union, and not any particular State. Another is a poetic retrospect of the American Congress, in which he takes a gloomy view of the man who regards his election to Congress as "a successful political trick," and tries to reform him by calling up memories of the great men who have sat in that body before him, and advises him to look at the signatures to the Declaration of Independence, one of which, that of John Hancock, has, he says, "a fourfold character, being at the same time a pledge, a prayer, a challenge, and a patriotic appeal." If this be true, we presume that there is no other signature like it in the world. Mr. Dix considers Christianity "the inspirer of nations," and the only proper basis of civil society, in this agreeing with that other eminent political thinker, Edmund Burke; but he gives a Christian government a great deal to do, such as to "encourage and develop honorable industry in

* Treatise on Politics as a Science. By Charles Reemelin. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1875.

The American State and American Statesmen. By W. G. Dix. Boston: Estes & Lauriat. 1876.

The Protection of Majorities and Considerations relating to Electoral Reform, with other Papers. By Josiah Phillips Quincy. Boston: Roberts Bros. 1876.

Nova Instauratio Reipublicæ. The Commonwealth Reconstructed. By C. C. P. Clark, M.D. Oswego. 1872.

all its branches" and "all manly enterprise," and enforce Christian law and discipline respecting marriage and divorce. The chapter on this subject contains an account of the political position of the Devil in this country which is the clearest and most careful statement on this subject we have seen anywhere, and is evidently the result of personal observation:

"In Europe the Devil is an outlaw—so regarded, so treated in theory by all Christian governments, however much in practice they may follow his counsel. But in America the Devil is not an outlaw, but a fellow-citizen in good and regular standing, who goes to the caucus which he has already packed, and finally prevails on a political candidate to accept, very reluctantly and diffidently, his nomination, which has been made to his great astonishment and surprise—as he says—but which he may have been trying with all his might to get for ten years. Then the Devil 'votes early and often' whenever he can. He goes to the National Conventions for nominating and enjoys himself very much, because they seem so natural and home-like. He is petted and patted on the back by committees of both political parties, who make heavy bids to get his support, and he accepts both bids and pockets the money. He is told that large and influential numbers of American citizens define a free country as one in which the Devil has equal rights with Almighty God, and argue that laws should be made or applied accordingly, which, being told for news, makes the Devil chuckle, for it is no news to him. Then he is told that many Americans regard him as the victim of a rather exclusive administration; that though it would not do to nominate him for the Presidency, because availability must first be considered and his nomination might offend some superstitious old bats who count nothing of themselves, though their votes do, yet that any special friend of his, and known to be such by the managers, would stand a good chance. Then they tell him that he can make the laws to suit himself, and then the Devil chuckles again, for he has already had a hand in making a good many of them, and then he winks and says, 'Indiana'; then they all laugh. One says, 'That's a good one'; then they all laugh again and take something. Then the Devil winks again and says, 'Connecticut.' Then another cries, 'That's another good one.' Then they laugh all round again and take something."

The rest of the book is taken up in working out, in a very denunciatory manner, theories of government which are those apparently of a very High-Church Episcopalian, with a deep hatred of Cromwell and serious doubts about the Puritans, considerable admiration for England and great devotion to national unity as opposed to State sovereignty, and gifted with a gorgeous rhetoric, which has apparently got the better of him, and rolls him through his volume as the surf rolls him along the beach in summer, if he ever ventures into anything so unbridled and unchristian as the sea.

Mr. Quincy's essay on the protection of majorities endeavors to deal, in the form of a dialogue between a Minister, a Merchant, a Journalist, and a Senator, with the great problem of getting rid of the tyranny and corruption of caucus nominations. He assumes that the majority in every American electoral division is honest and knows a good man when it sees him. The people of a town, for instance, find no difficulty in pointing out the best doctor, or lawyer, or grocer, or carpenter in the place. They would be equally competent to select the best legislator or administrator, but are prevented from doing so by the political managers, who, by organizing a caucus, take the work out of their hands and deprive them of all control over the nominations. He proposes, therefore, that the state should take charge of the nomination as well as of the election, and publish a paper called the *Nominator* in each locality, in which everybody should be at liberty to nominate, with a reasonable amount of explanation and commendation, any candidate he pleases, the suggestion to be adopted or not afterwards at the polls. This Mr. Quincy thinks would reduce the caucus to a mere debating-club,

and make underhand arrangements impossible. The proposal is ingenious and yet simple, but it assumes, we fear, greater intelligence and homogeneity in the community, and greater influence on the part of local notables, than are to be found anywhere out of New England. We are afraid that in many parts of the country the caucus would flourish side by side with the *Nominator*, and that the "practical men" would make great fun of the sheet in their secret conclaves. The weak place in all the arguments about reform which assume the public spirit and intelligence of the majority, is that they assume them as constant quantities, whereas they are very variable. The truth is, and it furnishes the professional politician with his stock-in-trade, that the majority is sometimes, and at its best, what its friends take for granted that it is constantly and in its ordinary moods. The men who are willing to watch always are sure to get control of the ship, no matter what their character, and to get the better of those who are only willing to watch when it blows hard.

Dr. Clark's pamphlet has been in our hands for some time. It preponds a plan of reform much more complicated than Mr. Quincy's. He describes the existing situation very ably, though in sombre colors, and aims at the same object as does Mr. Quincy—the deliverance of the political community from the domination of the caucus. He says that what gives the professional politician his power is our practice of giving our political constituencies fixed geographical boundaries. This keeps him constantly informed as to the nature and amount of his work. Knowing exactly the area he has to "subsoil," he calculates his wants, distributes his forces, makes his combinations, lays his "pipe," and rolls his "logs." If, therefore, we can prevent his knowing what the constituency will be until the day of election, his occupation is gone. So Dr. Clark proposes that registered voters be drawn by lots, in constituencies of a certain number each, fifty, one hundred, or one thousand, as the case may be, and that these proceed forthwith to choose a representative elector, and that these electors then elect the various State or town officers or members of Congress—service as elector being made obligatory. It is difficult to say how the constituencies created by lot would work, but Dr. Clark supports his plan by many forcible as well as ingenious arguments. It contains, in any event, the idea on which any great reform in our political system must rest—that is, the provision for the citizen of some safe and simple mode of bolting "the regular nomination." Such essays as Mr. Quincy's and Dr. Clark's, whatever their practical value, are signs of a healthy interest in the undoubted defects of our political machinery, and nobody can read them without deriving from them a great many useful suggestions about the solution of problems which we all perceive staring us in the face, but which some of us would fain leave our children to solve.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Bancroft (G.), History of the United States, abridged. Vol. I. (Little, Brown & Co.)	\$2 50
Browne (L.), Humorous Phases of the Law. (Summer, Whitney & Co.)	1 50
Feuillet (G.), Marriage in High Life. A Novel. (Porter & Coates)	1 50
Frothingham (Rev. O. B.), Beliefs of the Unbelievers. (G. P. Putnam's Sons)	1 00
Habberton (J.), Spectator. (G. P. Putnam's Sons)	1 25
Huntington (Rev. F. D.), New Helps to a Holy Lent. (E. P. Dutton & Co.)	1 50
King (E.), French Political Leaders. (G. P. Putnam's Sons)	1 50
Lilly (W. S.), Characteristics from the Writings of John Henry Newman. (D. & J. Sadlier & Co.)	1 50
Macmillan (Rev. H.), Our Lord's Three Raisings from the Dead. (E. P. Dutton & Co.)	1 50
Paul (C. K.), William Godwin. 2 vols. (Roberts Brothers)	6 00
Plain Directions for Accidents. (Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger)	
Taylor (R. W.), Stories from Ovid in Elegiac Verse. (Livingtons)	
Van Santvoord (Rev. C.), Memoirs of Eliphaz Nott, D.D. (Seldon & Co.)	
Welch (Prof. F. B.), Faith and Modern Thought. (G. P. Putnam's Sons)	
Wharton (F.), Commentaries on Agency and Agencies. (Kay & Brother)	
Wolff (C.), Historischer Atlas, Part I., swd. (E. Steiger)	

New Leisure-Hour Books.

16mo. \$1 25 each.

HER DEAREST FOE. By Mrs. Alexander.

NATHAN. By C. C. Fraser-Tytler.

PRETTY MISS BELLEW. By Theo. Tift.

VERS DE SOCIETE.

MR. SMITH. By L. B. Walford.

HENRY HOLT & CO.,

25 Bond Street, New York.

F. W. CHRISTERN,
FOREIGN BOOKSELLER AND IMPORTER,
77 UNIVERSITY PLACE, NEW YORK.

Large assortments of the publications of Charpentier, Didier, Didot, Hachette, Lévy Frères, etc., on hand; also complete lists of Tauchnitz's Collection of British Authors, and Teubner's Greek and Roman Classics. All European periodicals received weekly in parcels.

BOOKS AT LONDON PRICES.

Now Ready: Catalogue No. 8 of Rare, Valuable, and Curious Books, free on application.
JOHN EVANS, Importer, 318 Hudson Ave., Brooklyn, N.Y.

NOW READY.

Wharton on Agency and Agents.

One volume 8vo. price \$6 50.

A COMMENTARY ON THE

Law of Agency and Agents.

By FRANCIS WHARTON, LL.D.

Author of Treatises on 'Criminal Law,' 'Conflict of Laws,' 'Negligence,' etc. One volume 8vo.

KAY & BROTHER, LAW PUBLISHERS,

17 and 19 South Sixth Street, Philadelphia.

F. W. DEVOE & CO.,

Manufacturers and Importers of

Artists' Materials.

Wax-Flower Goods, Varnishes, White Lead,
French Zinc and Colors.

115 and 117 Fulton Street, New York.

B. F. STEVENS, AMERICAN

Library and Literary Agent, 4 Trafalgar Square, Charing Cross, London, England, supplies Books and Periodicals of every sort by mail or express at lowest London prices. Full particulars of terms and mode of remitting United States currency are given in his priced List of English Newspapers and Magazines, which may be had free on application to him direct in London, or to his Custom-House Brokers, Messrs. Tice & Lynch, 34½ Pine Street, New York.

FOR any Book Desired or Information

respecting Prices and Editions, address LOCKWOOD, BROOKS & CO., Boston, Mass., who will promptly reply. Books carefully forwarded, post-paid, on receipt of advertised price. Send for catalogue of our own publications.

